

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 965

SP 021 728

AUTHOR Clatworthy, F. James
TITLE Homer T. Lane's Legacy of Self-Government: An Inquiry into Organizational Synecology at the Boys Republic, 1909-1982.
PUB DATE 5 Nov 82
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the American Educational Studies Association (Nashville, TN, November 5, 1982).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Adolescents; Citizenship Education; Clinical Psychology; Correctional Education; *Correctional Institutions; Delinquency; Democratic Values; Discipline; Educational History; Educational Innovation; Institutionalized Persons; Males; Organizational Change; Problem Children; Secondary Education; Self Control; Self Determination; Self Esteem; Social Values; *Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS *Boys Republic; *Lane (Homer T)

ABSTRACT

In the spring of 1907, Homer Lane began his work with institutionalized problem boys when he became superintendent of the Boy's Home and d'Arcambal Association in Farmington Hills, Michigan. The program Lane developed at the school was geared toward building the boys' self-respect and self-reliance and toward giving them an opportunity to practice self-restraint through self-government. Lane regarded the school not as an institution but as a community of individuals forming a commonwealth, with a constitution serving as a compact between them. This paper traces the development of the institution, later called the Ford Republic and now known as the Boys Republic, both as an educational facility and as an organization. Gradual changes in the educational theories and practices of subsequent superintendents are described and analyzed, including the school's movement away from a self-governing family and work-training facility to a residential treatment facility. Sections in this paper discuss: (1) the genesis of Lane's idea of self-government; (2) the post-Lane years at the Boys Republic; (3) the contemporary organizational treatment philosophy; and (4) a comparative analysis between Lane's Boys Republic and A. S. Neill's "Summerhill" (Great Britain). A comparative analysis also is made of the characteristics of the school as it was originally conceived by Homer Lane and its present organizational and philosophic characteristics. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED225965

HOMER T. LANE'S LEGACY
OF SELF-GOVERNMENT:

AN INQUIRY
INTO ORGANIZATIONAL SYNECOLOGY
AT THE
BOYS REPUBLIC, 1909 - 1982.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. James Clatworthy

By

F. James Clatworthy
Associate Professor
Oakland University
Rochester, MI., 48063.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Draft Essay presented at the American Educational Studies
Association Conference, Nashville, Tenn., November 5, 1982.
Do not reproduce without permission of the author.

SP 024728

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1.
II. The Genesis of Lane's Self-Government	3.
III. Post Lane Years at the Boys Republic	13.
IV. The Contemporary Organizational Treatment Philosophy	16.
V. Comparative Analysis	20.
VI. Conclusion - Recommendation	23.
References	26.

I. Introduction.

In this paper I will examine three concepts that are important for the future of education and organizational change and innovation. The first concept is the experiment that Homer T. Lane initiated at the Boy's Home and d'Arcambal Association in December, 1908. In the spring of 1909 the home would informally be called the Ford Republic and in 1944 officially renamed the Boys Republic. The Boys Republic has a continuous institutional history from the 1907 to the present. For clarification purposes I will use the term Ford Republic for the Lane years and Boys Republic for the years after Lane served as Superintendent.

The second concept is organizational synecology. An organization represents a variety of internal and external interactions and since it is a community in an organizational sense, it has an interaction with its environment. The organizational (i.e. community) interaction with its environment and other organizations (i.e. communities) is the definition of synecology (1). In the field of biology there are ample studies done in synecology ranging from rain forests to termites, but so far the management and organizational studies literature has not used the concept of organizational synecology. A recent study by Donald N. Michael (2) on the organization as a learning system comes close to an inquiry into organizational synecology and recognizes the importance of organizational

learning as distinct from the expertise of individuals who make up the organization. The difference between a biological system and a human system is the latter's capacity to learn and to respond to change more rapidly than evolving genetic adaptation. The organization has access to human resources which enables it to compound the learning experiences and to make changes in its collective policy. This allows the organization to transcend internal and external environmental stress more successfully than an individual. However, the process needs nurturing and recognition of ways to improve the organizational learning process.

In the conclusion of the paper, the possibility of dealing with the expansion of the self-government process to improve organizational learning will be discussed. The concept may take on the character of old wine in new bottles, but the growing concern for downsizing and improving the quality of educational products may hasten the return of a basic democratic principle to improve the capacity of an organization to learn.

I would also like to acknowledge my gratitude to Professor Swartz for inviting me to give this paper and keeping me aware of the time deadline which did present a problem in gaining access to materials. However, our shared interest in the work of Homer Lane and the challenge to dig up some new resources, combined with the geographic closeness to the Republic, spurred me on. In addition, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Mr. Clyde L. Reed, Chairman of the Boys Republic Historical Committee, and a former Superintendent of the Republic. The Archives of the Republic are closed, but Mr. Reed has been extremely helpful in allowing me to examine some key material and to do several oral histories with me about the Republic. I was

also fortunate enough to meet with the present Superintendent of the Boys Republic, Mr. Gordon K. Boring, and wish to thank him for his assistance and cooperation. I am hopeful that further meetings will result from the initial inquiry of this paper and some other learning projects that the Boys Republic might investigate.

II. The Genesis of Lane's Self - Government program:

In the spring of 1907, Homer Lane began his work with institutionalized problem boys when he accepted a position as Superintendent of the Boy's Home and d'Arcambal Association at a 70 acre farm northwest of Detroit in what is now Farmington Hills, Mich.(3) His program of self-government, which led the boys to select the name Ford Republic, began in December, 1908, and was in full operation by March, 1909 (4). Lane never wrote about how the idea of self-government occurred to him or if he was influenced by the George Junior Republic in Freeville, N.Y. which was ^{publicized} written about in national magazines like Survey and Outlook (5). Lane did write about the practice of self-government for a local weekly newspaper, Detroit Saturday Night, in a series of newspaper articles about "Solving the Boy Problem".

It was Lane's theory that a boy goes wrong not because he was bad, but because he wanted to experiment with independence and self-reliance. The boy eventually ends up in Juvenile Court because of "positive virtues wrongly

expressed"(6). Lane raised an issue that he would later expand in his Talks to Parents and Teachers. The issue was how the Juvenile Court reacted to the boy:

Shall the first gun fired by the state as represented by the judge, be charged with fear or friendliness? If charged with fear, The Boy will concentrate all his strength to defeat the success of the bombardment -- craft, cunning, lies and false promises. If charged with friendliness and primed with sympathy, the shot will strike a point that has no defense -- the craving that every boy has for the friendliness of a manly man with whom he can establish a fellowship (7).

Lane used the dichotomy of fear and friendliness [later revised to fear and hope (8)] and the analogy of medical treatment. He indicated that although the best treatment facility for the boy's recovery was the home, there may be a need to send him to a hospital when the home, school or church could not provide the necessary treatment.

Lane noted that the family and school contributed to the pathological behavior of the child when adult authority in the home and school was tyrannical and void of justice and reason. Lane identified the teacher who ruled through fear of punishment as "one of the most potent contributory influences which makes for boy antagonism toward society"(9). Lane did not see how the teacher could teach social consciousness through history or geography unless the classroom was a republic and not a monarchy (10). Lane felt adolescent boys needed to have reasons for strict discipline. The rules against talking, whispering, moving about could be explained, according to Lane, in terms of the disturbance to the rest of the class. Rules with no attempt to discuss the needs of the group would only serve to challenge the

boy to strike out against the restraint of his personal liberty.

Lane came up with an interesting hypothesis on the inability of problem boys to carry on the thought process without quickly giving up and wanting to go on to something else. He attributed this to the constant interruption of street play due to a variety of service and vending wagons (11). The solution to the problem, in Lane's judgement, was more "supervised playgrounds" integrated into the educational system so that boys had more opportunities for social education.

Lane was also troubled by the program at the State Training School because the boys he saw were performing lockstep functions like watering plants even after several days of heavy rain. He criticized the public perception that the excellence of an institution should be judged by a treasurer's report rather than by the "boy-product of its work"(12).

Lane viewed the boy-product of the Ford Republic to be guided by three fundamental theories: (I.) self-respect; (II.) self-reliance and the all important element "X" (III.) self-restraint (13). The program at the Ford Republic was geared to building the self-respect and self-reliance of the boy and then giving him an opportunity to practice self-restraint through self-government which Lane defined as "the personal responsibility of the individual for the social worth of the community"(14). Lane made it clear that the Commonwealth of Ford was not an institution but a community of individuals and that the Constitution was the compact between individuals.

Lane described the operation of the weekly meeting of the Republic with a fourteen year old presiding as President in the concluding article in the series. The weekly meeting was the Legislative assembly of the Commonwealth with all citizens in attendance and one of the teachers acting as State Clerk.

Motions were made, seconded and approved or rejected. The approved motions became laws, for example, "taking eggs from the hen house and sucking them shall be against the law", or "if a citizen breaks a dish in the kitchen he must do dishes two days extra for every dish he breaks"(15). Laws could be made about staff responsibilities. For example, "the superintendent must give the citizens their manual training lessons whether he was busy or not"(16).

One problem with passing laws was keeping track of the existing laws to avoid duplication. An example from the minutes of the March 3, 1909, meeting was a motion that "no boy shall come to the table unless face, neck and ears are clean and hair combed"(17). The motion was ruled out of order by the President because there was already a law which covered the motion.

The Superintendent had one vote like everyone else, but obviously his views were taken into consideration if the boys understood the reasonableness of his comments and sensed there was no favoritism being advanced. An example from the meeting of March 10, 1909, involved a motion to have the Superintendent of Public Works, an elected boy, ducked in the creek for not keeping the fire under the hot water heater. After an excited exchange in which the accused boy was ordered out of the assembly for not keeping order, Lane gained the floor and explained the motion was unjust to the Superintendent of Public Works because the hot water heater was not working properly and the motion should not be carried until the water heater was repaired(18).

In addition to the Legislative body there was a Citizen's Court presided over by an elected Judge who, according to Lane, was a husky looking lad of fifteen laboring hard with Fourth grade school work. The Court heard citizen complaints and the Judge decided the punishment. The Judge could also use the

power of contempt of court for boys who got out of order during a hearing so the atmosphere of the Court was far less exuberant than the Republic meetings. Not only the boys, but even the Superintendent could be held in contempt of court as Lane was ordered out of the Court for laughing at a penalty imposed by the Judge(19). Lane gave a full account of this incident in Talks To Parents and Teachers in the chapter entitled "Release from Authority"(20) Lane helps a boy overcome his fear of math story problems by attempting to help but getting confused himself so the boy had to guide Lane through the opening part of the problem. Lane thinks up the "sick horse" excuse for leaving and the boy ends up having the matron report him for staying up past bed time doing arithmetic. Lane saw in this example the release of self-reliance after the anxiety of math was broken by giving the boy a greater sense of self-respect in the presence of an adult.

The Citizen's Court did not have jurisdiction over cases involving destruction of public property. In the early days, these cases were heard by the Supreme Court where the Superintendent was the Judge. Later (circa 1920's), the Supreme Court was used for appeals from the Citizen's Court and the Citizen's Court Judge and the Superintendent would hear cases immediately following the Citizen's Court(21).

Lane admitted in his article that the Court was not elegant but it was, "a fine quality of justice -- justice that comes from the heart and is the result of fellow feelings, and not justice that has been perverted by technical and legal phraseology into justice"(22).

Lane closed his article with an appeal for funds from the readers and gave an interesting insight into the financial affairs of the Republic. The annual budget of the program was \$7,500 in 1909, and J. L. Hudson, the founder of the

Hudson Department Stores in Detroit, gave \$2,400 to support the Republic. Lane called Hudson, "the prince of givers to all worth causes" and asked the readers to do their part so "the boy may be depended upon for his contribution"(23).

Lane and his staff began the self-government program the last week in December, 1908, and perfected the system over the next couple of months. The economic system, however, was not initiated until May, 1909(24). By the end of the month, each boy was keeping his own time card and the Republic kept a balance sheet for each boy on earnings and expenses. The economic system helped the boys gain a sense of reality in managing their own Republic fiat currency and gave the Republic an alternative punishment — fines. Boys were required to pay \$3.00 a week for board plus forty cents for Republic taxes to pay for boys who did not earn enough to cover their expenses and for elected officials. The boys in return were paid ten cents an hour for attending school for two and a half hours a day and either ten or fifteen cents an hour for working on the farm, in the kitchen, or on general maintenance for the State. A few boys who held elected positions were paid wages for the hours they put in to serve in those capacities.

Lane viewed the economic system as a tangible way to motivate boys with something that was close at hand and apparent. Lane stated:

Boys are not able to appreciate the abstractions of moral and social development, unless the advantages of progress are represented in a concrete form (25).

However, Lane's enthusiasm for the character building process of earning your way was also tempered by the realization that there may be a "rare exception" of a boy who does not respond spontaneously, "to the concrete encouragement as shown in the time book and the payroll"(26). Lane did state the scheme was

still in the experimental stage, but stressed the positive effects of a steady increase in the amount of work and the interest, loyalty and patriotism of the boys, rather than give an indication of how he might handle the boy who refused to accept the responsibility of the economic system of the Republic. Lane's genius, however, was in letting the boys work out these problems through the machinery of the Legislature and Court. Lane could make suggestions in the discussion on motions before the Republic, but he believed it was important for the boys to learn and experiment with the problems they faced collectively. Lane had no blue print to guide him, but he did have a deep belief that "the natural impulses of children were virtuous", including children who had gone wrong in the eyes of society (27). It was in Lane's nature to experiment and learn for he wanted to tap the boy nature that he believed was reachable if the boy had an opportunity to discover it for himself. In an attempt to understand "boy nature" as Lane called it and to find out if any juvenile court or agency had begun to base its treatment upon the boy himself, Lane attended the 36th National Conference of Charities and Correction held in Buffalo, N.Y., in June, 1909.

The Conference was a disappointment for Lane because the discussion was almost exclusively centered on the machinery of the institution rather than on the nature of the boy. There was one exception that Lane reported on:

The question of the most efficient method of punishment in the institution was the only subject discussed that had to do directly with the child, and was the only discussion of an educational nature which the writer heard (28).

Lane seemed irritated in reporting that the majority thought it would be necessary, "for those states which prohibit corporal punishment to reconsider the legislation on this matter, else the discipline in the institution would

suffer greatly"(29). Lane's interest was in the boy not the institution.

Lane's hypothesis was that the secret to juvenile delinquency could be found in the study of play time rather than home and school. The home, school probation officer and Courts were interested in the play time of the boy, "only to the extent of administering penalties for wrong doing during this period"(30). Lane's primary interest in play was because the child's instinct was to excel individually in some activity. It was around this concept that Lane began building the foundation for self-respect and self-reliance. However, if streets were the only place to play, then children's spontaneous activity was constantly being interrupted by adults who had to use the streets. Lane felt children quickly developed an antagonism toward adult authority depending on the frequency and degree of adult antagonism against the child. In addition to the street, there was the school supervision of play where the teacher misunderstood the nature of spontaneous child activity and introduced drill and practice to the playground. Play quickly became drugery and rebellion against school authority was a natural outlet. It was Lane's contention that:

Too much supervision of play or unscientific supervision of play, is as bad if not worse, than no supervision of play. Spontaneity is a positive essential to the development of all those virtues which are supposed to be reached through the play impulse of the child (31).

Lane later discovered that unsupervised playgrounds tended to reduce crime; whereas supervised playgrounds increased it(32). The difference could have been attributed to over supervision, or the drill and practice supervision that tended to happen with organized games. Lane also rejected the idea that the child would take on the attributes of the home during play time since, "few homes are conducted other than as adult institutions in which the

interests of the child are not considered"(33). The laws and rules in homes were made to protect the conveniences and tastes of the adult and, "usually in direct opposition to the tastes and interests of the child"(34). Lane's point was that most homes were adult monarchies and when he observed children playing they were more likely to play out their rebellion against adult authority and take on a more representative form of shared democracy.

One result of Lane attending the National Conference was an invitation to join the National Association of Junior Republics which had been founded by William R. George in February, 1909. It was George who pioneered the republic concept with the creation of the George Junior Republic in Freeville, N.Y. in 1895 (35). Lane turned down the invitation because he was not impressed with the prison system used at the George Republic. Lane felt the George Republic should offer an alternative to the standard prison methods(36).

The Ford Republic period for Lane was a learning and testing period where he struggled to understand the problem boy and worked through the self-government to get at developing self-respect, self-reliance and self-restraint in each boy. In working with problem boys, Lane noticed that adult authority seemed to aggravate the discipline problems; whereas, when boys were free to work out their own justice then discipline problems were lessened(37). Lane later used the analogy of the dog and rabbit to express the difference between hope and fear as a motivating force(38). The Ford Republic experiment for Lane would end in 1912 with a personal scandal in which Lane was accused of an indiscretion with one of the female teachers from the Republic by one of the Board members. Lane resigned as Superintendent and left Detroit and eventually restarted his self-government experiment in Dorset, England, with the operation of the Little Commonwealth from 1913 to 1918. That experiment also ended in scandal and, like the Ford Republic, was

another five year experiment in self-government. It is not within the scope of this paper to explore the similarities and differences between the Little Commonwealth and the Ford Republic, but it was in 1917 at the Little Commonwealth that A.S. Neill first met Homer Lane. Neill was never to teach at the Little Commonwealth because by the time he was discharged from the Army the school was closed, but he did become a pupil and patient of Lane's during the 1918 to 1925 period (Lane died in 1925), and was motivated to carry on the self-government experiment in his own school, Summerhill, in Leiston, England(39).

The two surviving branches of Homer Lane's interest in a self-governing community were in full operation during the 1930's in the Boys Republic in Farmington, Mich., and Summerhill in England. The two organizations continued to operate although the Boys Republic went through a transformation in the early 1960's and is no longer a self-governing republic although it is still a facility for delinquent boys. Summerhill continues to operate under Neill's second wife, Nina, even though some speculated the school would be closed after Neill's death in 1973.

What happened to the self-government concept at the Boys Republic after Lane's departure? How did the organization respond to new Superintendents with different ideas about the practice of self-government? What was the organizational cement that held the self-government practices in place? These questions will be explored next in the section on the Post Lane Years and in the following section on the Contemporary Organizational Treatment Philosophy.

III. The Post Lane Years At The Boys Republic

The great test for Homer Lane's family style (40) self-government program was whether or not it could succeed without him. In fact, after Lane was selected as Superintendent, the Chairperson of the Selection Committee had Professor Charles Cooley review Lane's work and recommended his continuation. The Professor raised the key question -- "...how far is his personality essential"(41)? Fortunately, Prof. Cooley recommended that Lane continue his work. Lane was able to develop the system of self-government that was similar to the George Junior Republic, but different in that there was no prison with striped uniforms and attempts to manipulate the inner workings of the government as Lane suspected of William George (42).

The operational experience with three years of self-government allowed the organization, boys and staff, to continue under new and subsequent Superintendents (43). The operations changed in refinements of the basic system, but the essentials remained the same with elected boy officials, a Court session and a Supreme Court as a Court of Appeals. The boys worked on the farm, earned their way, went to school and managed their affairs within the context of the Republic. Fortunately, there were Trustees who were highly supportive of the work that Lane had started and they wished to see the Republic continue. In particular were the driving forces of Fred M. Butzel and the financial support of J. L. Hudson. The influence of Fred Butzel is well documented by David Wills in his biography on Homer Lane (44). Another confirmation of Butzel's influence comes from Mr. Clyde Reed who was Superintendent of the Boys Republic from 1933 to 1948 (45). Mr. Reed was inspired by Fred Butzel, as was Homer Lane, and recalls the influence that

Butzel had on the Board of trustees in keeping the self-government process going. There were also staff members who came to the Republic as boys but later ended up working at the Republic. One such person was Joe Kalesar who was the clerk for the State Meetings in 1916, but who later returned to the Republic after World War II as a baker (46). Another staff member was Mrs. Ruth Colebank who joined the staff in 1912 and served until her retirement in 1954.

The best insights into the operation of the Boys Republic in the post Lane years are the personal recollections of Superintendent Reed (47). Mr. Reed joined the Republic in 1933 when the use of corporal punishment was rather severe for cases of property destruction, but he discouraged the practice of sentencing a boy to a line-up where boys would paddle the guilty party. Superintendent Reed favored the economic system for punishment where boys would be fined for offenses or take walks on the "Merry-Go-Round" which was a circular path in front of the main hall where boys would walk off their time under the supervision of the Sheriff. The Merry-Go-Round was started by Lane and continued until the school moved into new buildings in 1957. The Superintendent's role, however, was limited to his position as Judge of the Supreme Court and a participant in State Meetings; yet that was a highly influential role. Mr. Reed confirmed the openness of elections for President and Citizen's Court Judge and how the boys would elect responsible boys to fill those positions, especially the Judge since the boys did not want someone who would not be fair and impartial. The process of self-government was time consuming and limited the Superintendent's time to reflect on goals, directions, or the philosophy of the institution. The day to day organizational problems with maintenance, staff and ordering were more than

enough to keep the superintendent busy. However, the rewards of working with the boys at State Meetings and observing the boys making difficult but sound value judgements with their money were the the highlights for Superintendent Reed. He recalled one instance where a young boy, after his weekly account had been settled, only had enough money to buy a tie for parents day or go to the movie, but not both. After quite a mental struggle that Mr. Reed carefully avoided by not offering advice, the boy finally decided to buy the tie. This shows the value of building self-respect and self-reliance so the boy could reach the point where he could practice self-restraint. It would not have been possible without the opportunity to work, to pay for his room and board, taxes and fines, and to participate in the rule making structure. Mr. Reed firmly believed that the self-government practices combined with the monetary-work system had the power to modify behavior for the boys and give them real and meaningful life adjustment skills.

The official name of the Ford Republic was the Boys Home and d'Arcambal Association. The boys had elected to name the home the Ford Republic in 1909 in honor of Mrs. E.L.Ford, no relation to the automobile Fords, and her daughters who provided nearly fortyfive thousand dollars to rebuild and build a new power house and water sewage system after a fire in 1908. The name Ford Republic was somewhat confusing after the Ford Motor Car Company became internationally known since people assumed the Republic was a charitable enterprise supported by Henry Ford. Fund raising was made difficult by this erroneous assumption so the Board of Trustees officially changed the name to the Boys Republic along with changing their own title from Board of Trustees to Board of Directors in 1944 (48). These changes were only cosmetic since Superintendent Reed and the staff were fully committed to the self-government

and work-training program initiated by Homer Lane.

The organizational transformation of the Boys Republic began under Superintendent Reed, but was to take nearly twelve years and three Superintendents to complete. It was Reed who hired Gordon Boring, then a student at the University of Michigan, to work at the Republic during the summer and who would later become a Superintendent. And it was also under Reed that the changes in the Board of Directors began with the death of Fred. M. Butzel in 1948. The circle of principle personalities was complete — Butzel to Lane to Reed to Boring. But the fabric of self-government would slowly be unwoven by an organization going through a transition from a farm and training school to a clinical counseling facility.

IV. The Contemporary Organizational Treatment Philosophy

The transformation of the Boys Republic was not surprising given the growth in clinical psychology following World War II and the changing social, economic and political forces at work. Another important factor was the age of the facility and the pressure to take more boys as the disruptions and impacts of the second World War worked their way through the social demographics with the first ripples of the baby boomers in the mid-fifties. This necessitated a review of the physical plant which was built in 1908-1909 and by mid-fifties had been patched so many times it was almost beyond repair. The organizational need for new buildings and possible relocation necessitated architectual plans; thus, the Directors commissioned a prominent architectual firm, Minoru Yamasaki and Associates, and looked forward to

moving into a modern facility just a half mile west of the original location in June, 1957 (49). The change in the physical setting also increased the internal policy changes and the role of the clinical counseling program under the directorship of Gordon K. Boring. The new facility had several residential units or cottages that would make natural counseling units. On the other hand, Boring was pushing to increase the counseling function and clinical rehabilitation rather than to rely on the training and work program to nurture the self-reliance and self-restraint of the individual boy (50). As more emphasis was placed on counseling and individual therapy with boys, the typical reaction of "that's not how we used to do it!" was common from the older staff who had been hired by the Republic to do manual training and supervise the boys in various work assignments.

Under Boring's directorship, the clinical counseling program was expanded as the older training staff left and new counseling - teaching staff replaced them. The problem Boring was having with the older training staff was they had a tendency to think of the boys in terms of good or bad; whereas, the new clinic staff thought about the boys as sick or well (51). Another factor was the influence on policy from the professional staff Boring was bringing into the program and the willingness of Superintendent Huber to allow his professional staff to develop and implement program policy (52). Without strong advocates for the self-government and training programs on the Board of Directors and a Superintendent whose background was the ministry, it was reasonable that the Director of the Clinic would assume greater leadership. The final stage in the transformation was the appointment of Gordon Boring as Superintendent in 1960.

The Boys Republic under its longest and current Superintendent has moved from a self-governing family and work - training facility to a residential treatment facility for boys who are diagnosed too psychoneurotic for

out-patient treatment but not severe enough for hospitalization (53). According to Superintendent Boring the treatment theory is generally eclectic, but geared to group social work, individual therapy that is Freudian based and a cottage group concept with a counselor as a therapeutic head (54). The use of corporal punishment is prohibited and "counseling alone will continue to be used when boys are involved in negative behavior unless it is decided that denial of privilege is to be utilized" (55). Restraint of a youngster until he gains self-control is practiced, but it is not used often because it would trigger a placement review hearing and the probable reassignment of the boy to another treatment facility. In one fundamental way the Boys Republic has not changed since its beginning under Homer Lane since the present day organization states:

We believe it is our responsibility to see that the boy is provided with all of the opportunities possible to demonstrate his abilities to foster his creativeness. It is our firm conviction that there is no place in the world for an institution which deals with disturbed boys, if that institution does not have a warm heart to go with its scientific brain. (56)

The Boys Republic does not operate the self-governing model and has not used it since 1961 when an experiment with an honors group was initiated called the "House of Representatives" (57). The State Meetings were discontinued in June, 1957, when the move was made into the new facilities (58). Yet the cottages carried on a semblance of self-government with monthly meetings directing general concerns through channels for administrative resolution rather than passing motions. The machinery of self-government had become cumbersome, according to Superintendent Boring, and the boys themselves

were changing from wards of the court to more disturbed children with emotional imbalances. It was Boring's opinion that the individual treatment with group social work was more effective than struggling with the manipulative behavior often displayed at State Meetings (59). The experiment with the House of Representatives was an attempt to use model behavior as an incentive and to assimilate new boys into the institution under an improved big brother program (60). The experiment lasted only a couple of months and then fizzled out, not surprisingly, because the boys did not see enough positive results and the pressures on the representatives (61). There were some suggestions that were implemented like family style eating arrangements and the introduction of a merit program so that each boy would be advised of his class standing based on a point system. The responsibility for assigning points resided with the "Chart Committee" composed of the Assistant Director, Dean of Boys, Principle or Program Co-Ordinator, House Keeping Director, or a representative, two Psychologists and one teacher (62). The merit program was easily incorporated into the clinic counseling model and used on an individual basis rather than have a public program where boys might be in competition for more or less points. The counseling - therapeutic model provided a continuous feedback loop for the boy and the counselor and individualized treatment so that acting out behavior was minimal. This also helped create a more positive peer culture in which boys were interacting (63), but the treatment was focused on the individual boy rather than utilize the self-governing environment.

In his comments on the treatment theories discussed at the 36th National Conference of Charities in June, 1909, Homer Lane had searched for a treatment

based on the boy himself (64). What would he say of the counseling - therapeutic model which focused on the individual? Would Lane look at the machinery and say it was there to serve adults rather than children? And where was the elusive "boy nature" in all of this? Lane concluded his article with a prophetic vision:

...if boy nature does not readjust itself to meet the requirements of the machinery which has been built for its manipulation into good citizenship, there will continue to be a growing lawlessness on the part of our city children. (65)

Perhaps it might be useful to turn to a comparison of the self-government fabric initiated at the Boys Republic and transformed by its own organization in one instance and transformed by A. S. Neill at Summerhill in another.

V. A Comparative Analysis

There is little doubt that Homer Lane got the idea for his self-government scheme from either attending the 35th National Conference on Charities and Correction in 1908 where William George would have presented something about the George Republic, or by reading about the George Republic in national magazines. The evidence is the Constitutional Preamble, also used by the George Republic and the judicial system with a Citizen's court and Supreme Court (66) Lane's contribution was to modify the self-government concept from a village model to a family model (67) with the elimination of a prison system and an emphasis on affection. Lane was interested in helping the individual boy and used the story of Jerry's math anxiety as the example in "Release from

Authority"(68) and the episode of Jason breaking dishes and then threatening to break Lane's watch as illustrations (69). In both instances what was smashed, according to Lane, was the attitude about adult authority because of the atmosphere of freedom. Lane was convinced by the early twenties that "freedom cannot be given. It is taken by the child. Freedom involves discovery and invention, neither of which by their very nature can be embodied in any system. Freedom demands the privilege of conscious wrongdoing, and above all things freedom cannot exist in the presence of authoritative punishment"(70).

A.S. Neill was interested in individual therapy and self-government and acknowledged his debt to Homer Lane since it was Lane who introduced Neill to both child psychology and self-government (71). Neill, however, developed a more flexible self-governing process by simply combining rule making with hearings over charges of injustice into one school meeting that usually took the better part of Saturday morning. Also there was never the attempt to codify laws and rules at Summerhill as the children were constantly experimenting with abolishing bed times and then reinstating them when everyone was dog tired. The rules would be remembered in a collective sense and if forgotten remade. At the Boys Republic the laws were written down and after a while the compilation of rules became very burdensome and frustrated the parliamentary procedures (72).

It is interesting to note, however, that as Neill practiced psychoanalysis with his children in "private lessons", in the hopes of curing them, he found it took much longer than the single breakthrough sessions that Lane liked to use as examples (the math anxiety and watch story for example).

Neill found that children who did not come near him for their entire stay at Summerhill would leave cured. Thus, Neill came to the realization that it was not psychoanalysis that was helping but the freedom to live their own lives with rules that they helped create (73). A.S. Neill's experience with both self-government and psychoanalysis brought him around to the position of favoring the self-governing atmosphere as having the curative power rather than psychoanalysis.

The process unfolded differently at the Boys Republic since the self-governing procedures gave way to clinical therapeutic - psychoanalytic procedures with an emphasis on group social work, counseling and individual therapy. The present Superintendent does not see self-government as a viable therapeutic process; whereas, A.S. Neill found it to be a powerful therapeutic process.

The final comparison is on the organizational level. The Boys Republic took into account the social environment it operated in and organizationally adjusted to changing demographics and financial support. It also adapted to internal and external pressures to continue to provide a program that sought to rehabilitate boys that had gone wrong with authority. A.S. Neill's Summerhill, on the other hand, remained more a "mom and pop" shop and even stopped taking in problem children because of the wear and tear on the shop. Summerhill continues as a marvellous example of humane self-government, but with no convincing experimental data as to the validity of its founder's claims about its therapeutic qualities.

The Boys Republic also continues but on an organizational course that is charted on a clinical therapy approach that sees little value in a therapeutic

self-government experiment.

Are the two just examples of ships passing in the night or is there a potential for transformation that might have a more significant impact on the development of human resources? Their common heritage, in the work of Homer Lane, and the potential for learning may be the clues as to how a symbiosis between therapy and self-government might be achieved.

VI Conclusion -- Recommendation

In the introduction to this paper I suggested the possibility of dealing with the expansion of the self-government process to improve organizational learning. What has been recognized recently is the utilization of the organization's human resources to help the organization learn and establish an organizational policy to facilitate the 'double loop' learning (74). What is meant by 'double loop' learning in an organization is that in addition to the individuals improving the performance of their tasks and thereby contributing to the improvement of the organization, there is another learning loop which the organization must tap to help it learn in a collective sense about organizational goals and values which also affect the individual's learning capabilities. The organizational environment, or ambience, creates an atmosphere of trust or mistrust, risk taking or risk avoidance, values exploration or values polarization, experimentation or operational procedures, or in Lane's view hope or fear. What we have been learning about individuals we now need to apply to organizations, especially educational organizations or

organizations engaged in servicing human resources. The organizational personality is the norms, values and goals of the organization (75). But to what extent does the organization allow its personality to be discussed in terms of the individuals who make up the organization? In a sense, does it examine its own organizational personality and work to improve the organizational effectiveness?

In studies on why educational innovation fails, Arthur Levine has found that the institutionalization or routinization stage is the final stage before either boundary contraction or expansion take place (76). In the case of contraction of the organizational boundaries, the organizational personality is threatened which in turn blocks the organization's ability to transform its personality to meet new external needs.

The norms, values and goals of self-governance included into the organization's personality allows for a double loop learning opportunity for the organization. The organization keeps alive by experimentation and can more easily recognize new needs which is the first stage of the innovation process.

Perhaps this is a bit too theoretical and you are wondering what this all has to do with the Boys Republic and Summerhill. The point is that Summerhill's resources as an organization are nearly zero, but its norms, values and goals may be extremely valuable. It would be impossible, for example, for Summerhill to expand its boundaries and should anything happen to A.S. Neill's second wife, Nina, the school would likely close. The Boys Republic, on the other hand, is a potentially more viable organization which already recognizes the value of individual staff members learning (77). But

the values of self-governance are fragmented into clinical discussions about treatment modalities rather than recognized as part of the organization's personality. The organizational name does not reflect the organization's personality since there has been no experimentation with self-government since 1961 (78).

However, if the Boys Republic is open to learning, what better opportunity than the present to consider both a boundary expansion and the consideration of self-governance as a part of the organizational norms, values and goals. Organizational self-governance at least for the staff might be the first step. The second might be to utilize the Summerhill environment directly by placing children and one or two staff members there as a therapeutic experiment for a more thorough analysis of the rehabilitative qualities of an environment where, "if the emotions are free the intellect looks after itself"(79).

I think it is appropriate to close with a selection from Shelley that Homer Lane used to point the way on the need to experience self-government:

The man

of virtuous soul commands not nor obeys.
Power like a desolating pestilence
Pollutes whate'er it touches: and obedience,
Bane of all genius, virtue, freedom, truth,
Makes slaves of men, and of the human frame
A mechanized automaton. (30)

References

1. It is erroneous to use ecology which is the definition for a single organism's interaction with its environment.
2. D.N. Michael, The New Competence: The Organization As A Learning System, (Menlo Park , CA.: SRI International, 1980).
3. The original site was located on the north side of Nine Mile Road just west of Inkster Road and moved a half mile west in 1957.
4. Homer T. Lane, "Solving The Boy Problem," Detroit Saturday Night (Vol.3, No.5, March 27, 1909), 18. Hereafter Detroit Saturday Night is abbreviated DSN
5. J. M. Holl, Juvenile Reform In The Progressive Era (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1971), 9.
6. H.T. Lane, "Solving The Boy Problem," DSN (Vol.3, No.2, March 6, 1909) p.12.
7. Ibid.
8. H..T.Lane, Talks To Parents And Teachers (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), 122. Hereafter referred to as Talks.
9. H.T. Lane, "Solving The Boy Problem," DSN (Vol.3, No.3, March 13, 1909), 4.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. H.T. Lane, "Solving The Boy Problem," DSN (Vol.3, No.4, March 20, 1909), 4.
13. Ibid., p.12
14. Ibid.
15. H.T. Lane, "Solving The Boy Problem," DSN (Vol.3, No.5, March 27, 1909), 18.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. H.T. Lane, Talks, op.cit., p. 179--187.

21. Personal interview with Mr. Clyde L. Reed, September 23, 1982.
22. H.T. Lane, "Solving The Boy Problem," DSN (Vol.3, No.5, March 27, 1909), 19.
23. Ibid.
24. H.T. Lane, "Making Boys Real Citizens," DSN (Vol.3, No.14, May 29, 1909), 9.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. H.T. Lane (A Friend of The Boy), "Too Little Study of The Boy," DSN (Vol.3, No.17, June 19, 1909), 16.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid. Lane was Superintendent of Playgrounds in Detroit prior to his appointment as Superintendent of the Boys Home (Ford Republic)
31. Ibid.
32. H.T. Lane, Talks, op. cit., 97-98.
33. H.T. Lane, DSN (v.3, n.17, June 19, 1909), 16.
34. Ibid.
35. William R. George, The Junior Republic (New York: D. Appleton, 1910), 42-48.
36. J.M. Holl, op. cit., 214-215. Holl makes the Montague-George-Lane and Neil connection (Holl misspells Neill's name throughout his book-- something A.S. Neill foresaw in educational histories!)
37. H.T. Lane, Talks, op. cit., 97-98.
38. Ibid.
39. Ray Hemmings, Children's Freedom: A.S. Neill and The Evolution of the Summerhill Idea (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), 63.
40. J.M. Holl, op. cit., 216 and E.T. Bazeley, Homer Lane and The Little Commonwealth (New York: Schocken, 1969), 13-18.
41. D. Wills, Homer Lane : A Biography (London: Allen & Unwin, 1964), 79

42. J.M. Holl, op.cit., 215.
43. The succession of Superintendents after Homer T. Lane : J.M. Mc Indoo, 1912-1922; Claude P. Jones, 1922-1933; Clyde L. Reed, 1933-1948; Charles E. Henry, 1948-1953; Milton J. Huber, 1953-1960; Gordon K. Boring, 1960 to present.
44. D. Wills, op.cit., 72-85.
45. Personal interview with Mr. Clyde L. Reed, September 15, 1982.
46. Boys Republic State Meeting Minutes, January 29, 1916; February 24, 1916; March 2, 1916. Boys Republic Collection, The Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs (ALHUA), Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich. Also Letter Reed to Clatworthy, October 20, 1982.
47. Personal interviews with Clyde L. Reed, September 15 and 23, 1982.
48. Boys Republic Collection Summary, ALHUA, Wayne State University.
49. Boys Republic Archives, op.cit., and C.L. Reed, Interview, 9/23.
50. Personal Interview with Mr. Gordon K. Boring, October 22, 1982.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid.
53. Boys Republic Agency Manual, Revised January, 1981, 2.
54. G.K. Boring, Interview, 10/22.
55. Boys Republic Agency Manual, 6
56. Ibid., 3-4.
57. "House of Representatives Organizational Meeting", July 18, 1961, Boys Republic Archives, op.cit.
58. G. K Boring, Interview, 10/22/82.
59. Ibid.
60. "House of Representatives", op.cit.
61. Ibid.
62. "Boys Republic Merit Program" (circa 1961), Boys Republic Archives

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1.
II. The Genesis of Lane's Self-Government	3.
III. Post Lane Years at the Boys Republic	13.
IV. The Contemporary Organizational Treatment Philosophy	16.
V. Comparative Analysis	20.
VI. Conclusion - Recommendation	23.
References	26.

63. G.K. Boring , Interview, 10/22/82
64. H.T. Lane, "Too Little Study of the Boy", op.cit.
65. Ibid.
- 66 H.T. Lane, "Solving the Boy Problem", DSN (V.3,N.5, March 27,1909).
67. J.M.Holl, op.cit.,216.
68. H.T.Lane, Talks, op.cit., 178-187.
69. Ibid., 162-169.
70. Ibid., 112.
71. Ibid., 8 (A.S.Neill's Introduction to 1969 edition).
72. G.K. Boring, Interview, 10/22/82.
73. "Summerhill" National Film Board of Canada, 1968.
74. C. Argyris, "Double-Loop Learning: Implications for Individuals and Organizational Development," Lecture at U. of Michigan, March, 1979. See also Organizational Development, Winter,1982.
75. A. Levine, Why Innovation Fails (Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press, 1980),11.
76. Ibid.
77. G.K. Boring, Interview 10/22/82.
78. Ibid.
79. A.S. Neill in Talks, op.cit., 10.
80. H.T. Lane, Talks, op.cit., 149.